

## REMARKS

The Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated August 17, 2004 (Paper No. 12). Claims 25 to 34 and 44 to 59 are in the application, of which Claims 25, 44 and 53 are independent. Claims 53 to 58 are being amended, and Claim 59 is being added. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Initially, Applicants gratefully acknowledge the indication in the Office Action of patentable subject matter, with Claims 25 to 34 and 44 to 52 being allowed.

Claims 57 and 58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. In response, the claims are amended. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

Claims 53 to 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 5,978,563 (Kawamoto)<sup>1</sup>, and Claim 57 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Kawamoto. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

The present invention generally concerns a printing apparatus which has a plurality of parallel developers to develop the print data into image data, which is then printed. The printing apparatus receives pages of print data, and judges whether or not the print data is of format representing a predetermined description language. The print data is assigned to the developers based on the result.

By virtue of this arrangement, it is possible to assign print data to

---

<sup>1</sup> In view of the November 2, 1999 issue date of Kawamoto, it is assumed that the Office Action intended to bring the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a), rather than 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). However, if this is not the case, clarification is respectfully requested.

developers based on whether or not the print data uses a predetermined description language.

Turning to the specific language of the claims, Claim 53 recites a printing apparatus which comprises a receiving means, a plurality of parallel developing means, and a printing means. The receiving means receives a plurality of pages of print data. The plurality of parallel developing means develop the print data into image data, and the printing means prints the image data. The receiving means further comprises a judging means for judging whether or not a format of the received print data represents a predetermined description language, wherein the judging means assigns the print data to the developing means based on the judging result.

The applied art, namely Kawamoto, is not seen to teach each and every feature of the present invention, particularly as regards a judging means for judging whether or not a format of received print data represents a predetermined description language, and for assigning the print data to the developing means based on the judging result.

Kawamoto is seen to describe differentiating between environmental and drawing commands contained in the print data, so as to divide the print data into partial print data items which are capable of being independently executed. That is, the drawing commands are grouped with the environmental commands, which contain the environment settings needed to perform the drawing commands. (See Kawamoto, Figures 1 and 2, and col. 7, line 63 to col. 8, line 61) However, analyzing a command contained in the print data to determine whether the command is a drawing command or an environment-setting

command is not seen to be the same as judging the format of print data to judge whether or not it represents a predetermined description language, and assigning the print data to based on the result.

Thus, Kawamoto, and in particular the cited portion of Kawamoto, is not seen to teach a judging means for judging whether or not a format of received print data represents a predetermined description language, and for assigning the print data to the developing means based on the judging result.

Therefore, for at least the foregoing reasons, Claim 53 is believed to be in condition for allowance.

The remaining claims are each dependent from the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.


In this regard, according to new Claim 59, the judging means judges whether or not the received print data has a format representing a page description language, or PDL, and assigns the print data based on the judging result.

Since Kawamoto is not seen to show these features, Claim 59 is believed to be in condition for allowance.

In view of the foregoing, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa,  
California office by telephone at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should be directed to  
our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Carole A. Quinn  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No.: 39,000

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-2200  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA\_MAIN 88246v1